

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 7-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 14 have been amended. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following explanation.

II. Rejection of Claims 7 -14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,682 (“Sims”). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). Still further, not only must each of the claim features be identically described, an anticipatory reference must also enable a person having ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed subject matter. (See Akzo, N.V. v. U.S.I.T.C., 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986)). To the extent that the Examiner may be relying on the doctrine of inherent disclosure, the Examiner must provide a “basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied art.” (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; see also Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int’f. 1990)). Thus, the M.P.E.P. and the case law make clear that simply because a certain result or characteristic may occur in the prior art does not establish the inherence of that result or characteristic.

In the Advisory Action mailed on January 11, 2010, the Examiner contended that the preamble recitations are not given any patentable weight, and therefore the teachings of Sims read on the main body of independent claims 7 and 14. While Applicants completely disagree with the Examiner’s contentions, in order to expedite resolution of the present application, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 14 to explicitly recite in the body of the

claims further limitations regarding the display unit. In particular, amended claim 7 recites, in relevant parts, “adapting the text information to be output to the driver of the vehicle via the display unit of the driver information system located inside the vehicle, depending on the predetermined display capacity of the display unit of the driver information system located inside the vehicle.” Amended claim 14 recites substantially similar features as the above-recited features of amended claim 7.

In contrast to the above-recited claimed features, the disclosure of Sims has absolutely nothing to do with “adapting the text information to be output to the driver of the vehicle via the display unit of the driver information system located inside the vehicle, depending on the predetermined display capacity of the display unit of the driver information system located inside the vehicle”; instead, Sims merely discloses attaching an exterior message panel adjacent to a license plate on a bumper of a vehicle. To the extent the Examiner is implicitly arguing that the exterior message panel disclosed by Sims is somehow equivalent to the claimed display unit of a driver information system in a vehicle, there is no reasonable basis for this interpretation since the exterior message panel is clearly not part of a driver information system for the driver of the vehicle, let alone located within the vehicle.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 7 and 14, as well as dependent claims 8-13, are allowable over Sims. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is requested.

Application Serial No. 10/590,769
Attorney Docket No. 10191/4286
Amendment Accompanying RCE

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 7-14 are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

 (R. NO. 35,952)

Dated: May 25, 2010

By: SONG LEE for Gerard Messina
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646